

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action the claims were again rejected as being obvious in view of the previously cited Nakamura, Murayama, and Hayashi patents. However, as a result of the foregoing amendments of independent Claims 1, 17, and 20, it is believed that all of the claims are allowable for the reasons set forth below.

In the Office Action it is acknowledged that “Nakamura in view of Murayama does not disclose expressly that the smoothing process which is performed to create a correction table uses some pieces of data whose number changes depending on the position of data in the generated train of data; and that the number of pieces of data in the smoothing process is selected on the basis of density reproduction characteristics of said image forming apparatus”. But then it is contended that Hayashi discloses these features (Page 5 of the Office Action).

Referring particularly to the disclosure of the Hayashi patent it is submitted that column 13, lines 23-33 is directed to calculation of a pre-gradation correcting curve, but that Hayashi teaches nothing as to the smoothing process. Then, Applicant submits that the recitation at column 11, lines 34-44 is directed to a plurality of test images, and that the recitation at column 14, lines 49-61 is directed to execution of pattern matching in each of three sections R1-R3 so as to find a curve pattern which is closest to the pre-gradation correcting curve. Again, those portions teach nothing as to the smoothing process, wherefore they are silent as to Applicant’s claimed requirement that “the correction table for correcting the image data read by said reading means is created by performing the smoothing process using some pieces of data whose number changes depending on the position of data in the determined train of density data.”

The recitation at column 17, lines 10-15 of Hayashi is directed to execution of pattern matching in each of the separate sections R1-R3 so as to obtain a gradation correcting curve, and the recitations in column 13, lines 23-33 and in column 14, lines 25-38 are directed to calculating the pre-gradation correcting curve on the basis of the output characteristics of the printer and obtaining the difference between the pre-gradation correcting curve and a curve pattern so as to execute pattern matching, respectively. While those portions may disclose determining the pre-gradation correcting curve on the basis of the output characteristics of the printer, and executing pattern matching in each of sections R1-R3, they fail to teach the claimed requirement that “the correction table for correcting the image data read by said reading means is created by performing the smoothing process using some pieces of data whose number changes depending on the position of data in the determined train of density data,” and the requirement that “the number of pieces of data used in the smoothing process is set on the basis of density reproduction characteristics of said image forming apparatus.”

For these various reasons, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose creating the correction table on the conditions that:

(a) some pieces of data are used whose number changes depending on the position of data in the train of density data; and

(b) the number of pieces of data used in the smoothing process is set on the basis of density reproduction characteristics of the image forming apparatus.

As a result of these failures of the cited patents as rejecting references, Applicant solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/

John A. Krause

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, New York 10112-3801

Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 615659v1